

OPINION 1564

Neamia octospina Smith & Radcliffe in Radcliffe, 1912 (Osteichthyes, Perciformes): specific name conserved

Ruling

(1) Under the plenary powers the specific name *sphenurus* Klunzinger, 1884, as published in the binomen *Apogon sphenurus*, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The name *Neamia* Smith & Radcliffe in Radcliffe, 1912 (gender: feminine), type species by original designation *Neamia octospina* Smith & Radcliffe in Radcliffe, 1912, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.

(3) The name *octospina* Smith & Radcliffe in Radcliffe, 1912, as published in the binomen *Neamia octospina* (specific name of the type species of *Neamia* Smith & Radcliffe in Radcliffe, 1912), is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

(4) The name *sphenurus* Klunzinger, 1884, as published in the binomen *Apogon sphenurus* and as suppressed in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.

History of Case 2541

An application for the conservation of *Neamia octospina* Smith & Radcliffe in Radcliffe, 1912 was received from Dr O. Gon (*J. L. B. Smith Institute of Ichthyology, Grahamstown, South Africa*) on 18 November 1985. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 44: 251–252 (December 1987). Notice of the case was sent to appropriate journals. The author has stated that Dr J. E. Randall, of *Bishop Museum, Hawaii, U.S.A.*, supports the application.

A comment by Professor L. B. Holthuis suggested that instead of suppressing *sphenurus* Klunzinger, 1884 precedence could be given to *octospina* Smith & Radcliffe in Radcliffe, 1912. The name *sphenurus* (based on a Red Sea specimen) would then be available if the Red Sea population proved to be a different taxon from that of the Indo-West Pacific (i.e. *octospina*, with its type locality in the Philippines). However, modern specimens from the Red Sea and Indian Ocean have been referred to *octospina* and there has been no suggestion that the populations from the two areas differ (Gon, 1987). [Despite the title of Gon's paper (see the list of references on BZN 44: 252) he used *octospina* as the valid name].

Decision of the Commission

On 1 March 1989 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 44: 251–252. At the close of the voting period on 1 June 1989 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes — 17: Bayer, Bock, Cocks, Cogger, Corliss, Hahn, Halvorsen, Holthuis, Kabata, Kraus, Nielsen, Ride, Savage, Schuster, Thompson, Uéno, Willink

Negative votes — 4: Dupuis, Lehtinen, Martins de Souza and Mroczkowski.

No vote was received from Heppell. Starobogatov and Trjapitzin were on leave of absence.

Dupuis and Mroczkowski would have favoured precedence being given to *octospina*. Martins de Souza did not consider the case strong enough to override the priority of *sphenurus*.

Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Neamia Smith & Radcliffe in Radcliffe, 1912, *Proceedings of the U.S. National Museum*, **41**: 441.
octospina, *Neamia*, Smith & Radcliffe in Radcliffe, 1912, *Proceedings of the U.S. National Museum*, **41**: 441.

sphenurus, *Apogon*, Klunzinger, 1884, *Fische des Rothen Meeres*, p. 20.